



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

II.—LUCILIUS ON *EI* AND *I*.

It is the custom, rightly or wrongly, to consider that when Lucilius gave rules for the use of *ei* and *i* to represent the long *i*, he did not know what he was talking about. Typical comments are the following:

Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 9: "Lucilius prescribed rules for the use of *ei* and ' *i* longa ' ; but instead of keeping *ei* for the original diphthong, and the single letter for the original long vowel, he used foolish distinctions,¹ if we are to believe Velius Longus (56. 7 K.) . . . ". The note referred to after the word *distinctions* reads: "Or should we call them mnemonic, as opposed to scientific, distinctions, meant to impress the orthographic rules on the memory of the common people for whom Lucilius wrote his book? (see Lucil. 26. 1. M.) "

Sommer, *Handbuch der lateinischen Laut- und Formenlehre*, p. 86: " Bisweilen hat Lucilius hier zufällig das etymologisch Richtige getroffen, doch geben die kurzen Stücke, die von seinen Regeln erhalten sind, kein Anrecht darauf, ihm in allen Fällen absolutes Zutrauen entgegenzubringen ". Ib., p. 368: " Auch Lucilius schreibt im G. sg. -*z* gegenüber -*ei* im N. pl. vor (IX, 16 ff. M.), doch geht seine Unterscheidung wohl von schulmeisterlichen Spekulationen aus und stimmt nur zufällig mit dem Verhalten des älteren inschriftlichen Materials überein ".

However, a closer investigation of the Lucilian passages has led the writer to think that perhaps the rules which he lays down have more basis in reason than is generally conceded to them. To discuss this matter is the purpose of this paper.

In the first place, it has been definitely settled that the confusion in spelling of original *ei* and earlier *z* (either original or due to compensatory lengthening) does not appear until just after 150 B. C. Earlier than this the inscriptions consistently employ *EI* or (occasionally) *E* for original *ei*, and never show *EI* for earlier *z*. But by 150 the sound of the diphthong, after passing through an intermediate stage *ē*, became identical with that of earlier *z*, and confusion in spelling resulted, *EI* and *I*

being used indiscriminately for the sound, of whichever origin it might be.¹

The fragments of Lucilius, in which rules are given for correct orthography in this matter, occur in the ninth book of the *Satires*, written in the period 116-110 B. C., according to Marx. At this time the confusion of the sounds was a long established matter; but that does not prove that Lucilius was unable to make the distinctions. Lucilius was born in the year 180, and had reached his thirtieth year before the two sounds became confused in writing. He had therefore learned the orthography prevalent in the first half of the second century before Christ, in which the confusion did not exist, and when he sets down rules for spelling in this matter, we may expect him to hand over to us the rules which had been taught him in his boyhood and which he had used in his own early manhood. Thus there is every reason *a priori* to believe that his dicta in this matter are based on real knowledge of the practices before the confusion existed.

In dealing with the fragments on this topic, it is to be remembered that the readings of the MSS are not to be depended upon in the least for the use of *ei* and *i*² in the words cited as examples: these examples must be spelled according to the remarks which the author proceeds to make concerning them. Now the text of these lines, according to the edition of Marx, is as follows:

'meille' hominum, duo 'meilia', item huc e utroque opus, 'meiles'	
'meilitiam'. tenues i: 'pilam' in qua lusimus, 'pilum'	
quo <i>piso</i> , tenues. si plura haec feceris pila	360
quae iacimus, addes e 'peila' ut plenius fiat.	
porro hoc si filius Luci	A-
fecerit, <i>i solum</i> , ut 'Corneli Cornificique'.	
iam 'puer <i>i</i> venere' e postremum facito atque i,	-B-
ut puer <i>i</i> plures fiant. i si facis solum,	365
'pupilli, pueri, Lucili', hoc unius fiet.	
mendaci furique addes e, cum dare furi	-C
iusseris	
'hoc illi factum est uni', tenue hoc facies i:	
'haec ille <i>i</i> fecere', addes e, ut pinguius fiat.	370

¹ Sommer, op. cit., p. 86.

² Cf. Anderson, T. A. P. A., XXXVII 73-86, especially 84-86.

In the first passage, 358-361, all editors take *item huc e utroque opus* as referring to the following examples, *meiles meilitiam*; they therefore apply *tenuēs i*, following *meilitiam*, to the following *pilam*, etc. To this there are two objections: the passage contains four examples or sets of examples, and four comments upon the spellings, alternating with each other; it seems at first sight that each example or set of examples needs a comment—then *item huc e utroque opus* refers to the preceding, and each of the other comments refers to what precedes it. The usual interpretation gives two comments to the third set of examples, one or the other of which is superfluous, and gives none to the first set, which needs comment. Secondly, if no comment be given to the first set of examples, it will not be clear¹ how they are to be spelled, since the verses seem intended for oral instruction.² I would therefore unhesitatingly place a period after *opus*, and another after *tenuēs i*.

To take up first *item huc e utroque opus*: the text is a manifest improvement over the *huic utroque* of Dousa and most editors, the *heice utroque* of Müller, and the *hisce utroque* of Keil, since it follows exactly the codex. Marx³ supports the reading *huc* by citing Plaut. Rudens 726:

Tu, senex, si istas amas, huc arido argentost opus,

in which *huc* replaces the dative of possession. *Utroque* now offers difficulty, since the meaning is manifestly "both these need e", and yet it cannot be dative. The dative in *-o* in *uter* and its compounds is a late Latin peculiarity, not found before Apuleius.⁴ As an ablative *utroque* might agree with *e*—"these need both e's", but the sense and the manner of expression are not clear. It is more likely that as *huc*, adverb of direction whither, replaces the dative, *utroque*, likewise the adverb of direction whither, has replaced the dative also, and that *huc utroque* is a colloquial equivalent of *his verbis utrique*; the meaning is therefore "these words both need e". This interpretation, moreover, confirms the correctness of the reading *huc*. Marx⁵ apparently takes this view of *utroque*, though he refers it to what follows instead of to what precedes, saying: *utroque* ad duo vocabula quae secuntur pertinet adver-

¹ Cf. preceding footnote.

² Cf. p. 278.

³ II 134.

⁴ Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre d. lat. Spr. II³, pp. 541 ff.

⁵ II 134.

bium; but the brevity of his expression leaves uncertain his exact interpretation of the manner in which it denotes them.

Marx¹ considers that the monosyllable *e* suffers elision; but this is not to be admitted. It is well known that the interjection *O* does not suffer elision, though if metrically unaccented it is sometimes shortened before an initial vowel. Marx's index² cites *e* in this line and in 370, *pro* 1266, *nam* 215, *ne* 266, *si* 313, *cum* 456, *te* 1304, *dem* 577, as monosyllables suffering elision; but of *pro*, *nam*, *ne*, *si*, *cum*, *te*, *dem* there is a consonantal remnant after the elision. In 370 the reading of Marx is *adde e, ut*; but Schmidt's *adde e, ut* avoids the necessity of total elision. In the present passage total elision of *e* is even less permissible: forms of *uter* in Lucilius invariably have the initial syllable short, as we can see from Marx's own index³ (vv. 419, 584, 781, 1011, 1119); and with total elision of *e*, the meter would require this initial syllable to be long. Now the names of letters form long syllables, as we see in vv. 361, 363, 364, 365, 367; I therefore scan *hūc ē ūtrōque*, with shortening of the (metrically unaccented) long vowel before an initial vowel, a frequent phenomenon in the earlier poets.

Turning now to the words whose orthography Lucilius is discussing, I adopt Dousa's *meillia* for *meilia*, since the Monumentum Ancyranum authorizes *ll* in the plural of this word as well as in the singular. Though early inscriptions do not write doubled letters, the consonants, if pronounced double, appear doubled in writing from 189 B. C. onward, and this spelling became the established method by the time of the Gracchi,⁴ which is before the composition of this passage. Lucilius would undoubtedly conform to this norm, as the doubling was in accord with the pronunciation, and the single writing was not and never had been.

In applying the comment *item huc e utroque opus* to the examples *meille* and *meillia*, only one point remains to be considered—the meaning of *item*. *Item* usually means *in the same manner as* something that has gone before, thus correlating two things or sets of things. But here, if this comment refers to *meille* and *meillia*, it must refer either to some example immediately preceding the citation, which is most unlikely; or mean *aeque*, that is, “both need *e*, *meille* and *meillia* alike”. While

¹ II 134.

³ I 155.

² I 163, *elisis monosyllabi*.

⁴ Lindsay, *Latin Language*, p. 8.

this is not a violent shift of meaning, still no example of such use can be found by me, and I therefore propose this punctuation :

'meille' hominum, duo 'meillia' item : huc e utroque opus.

Item now has its usual meaning, 'in the same way as the preceding', and emphasizes the fact that both singular *meille* and plural *meillia* have *ei*, unlike singular *pueri* (genitive) with *i* and plural *puerei* (nominative) with *ei*, as we see in 364-366. It is no objection to this punctuation that there is now no caesura, but a break at the end of the third foot; Lucilius furnishes abundant examples of this :

- 34 quare diuinas quicquam ? an tu qua <ere> re debes
 82 non dico : 'uincat' licet, et uagus exulet, erret
 173 cumque hic tam formosus homo ac te dignus puellus
 203 nam si, quod satis est homini, id satis esse potisset
 293 tristis, difficiles sumus, fastidimus bonorum

and 109, 111, 171, 179, 189, 260, 271, all with similar metrical defects, though of slightly varying natures. Yet these 12 lines all occur within the first 300 verses of Lucilius (edition of Marx).

Lucilius testifies therefore to *meille*, *meillia*. Unfortunately this is one of the uncertain words, not occurring in inscriptions early enough to show its etymology, so far as the vowel of the initial syllable is concerned. Its earliest occurrence is on the milestone of Popilius, C. I. L. I 551, where *MEILIA* and *MILIARIOS* both occur; as the date of the inscription is 132 B. C., we hereby get no information. But as Sommer's derivation¹ of *mille* from **smī* *ghslz*, though accepted by Walde,² has been by Brugmann³ relegated to a place among the improbabilities, it is at least possible that Lucilius may be right in spelling *meille* and *meillia* with the diphthong.

The next portion of the text, taking *tenuēs i* to refer to the preceding and not to the following, is :

'meiles'

'meilitiam', *tenuēs i*.

Scaliger changed the *mille militiam* of the codex to this form as cited, understanding *item*, etc., to refer to these two words. While he was unquestionably right in identifying the words, his

¹ I. F. X 216-220, XI 323-324.

² Lat. etym. Wörterb. s. v., even in the second edition.

³ I. F. XXI 10-13.

faulty interpretation of the comment caused him to insert an unwarranted *e* in each one. We must read:

‘miles’

‘militiam’, *tenuēs i*.

This *i*, not *ei*, in these words is confirmed by the inscriptions. *TRIBVNOS MILITARE* occurs in C. I. L. I 63, presumably older than the second Punic war, and *TRIB MIL* is found in C. I. L. I 35, probably of the period 160 to 155 B. C. Both of these are early enough to show distinction between the simple long vowel and the diphthong, and agree in their evidence. Lucilius is therefore right in assigning the simple long vowel to *miles*¹ and to *militiam*.

Lucilius’ discrimination between *meille* and *miles* in the matter of spelling is the more interesting because the antiquarian Varro, some 65 years later than Lucilius, considered *miles* to be a derivative of *meille*: L. L. V 89 milites, quod trium milium primo legio fiebat ac singulae tribus Titiensium, Ramnium, Lucerum milia militum mittebant. While avoiding this error, Lucilius has also avoided any voicing of the silly notion of his friend Aelius Stilo, cited by Paul. Fest., p. 122 M.: Militem Aelius a mollitia κατὰ ἀντίφρασιν dictum putat, eo, quod nihil molle, sed potius asperum quid gerat; sic ludum dicimus, in quo minime luditur.

Marx’s reading for 359 makes *-es i pi-* a dactyl; but comparison with 361, 363, 364, 365, 367 shows that *i* and *e* as names of letters are long syllables. This in itself proves that the syllables are to be reduced by one; but if further proof be needed, we have only to recall that Lucilius is discussing the spelling of *i*, not of *ī*, and that *pi-* must be *pī-*. The codices here have *tenuēs i*, which is kept by most editors, though Müller has *tenuēst i*. I propose *tenuē i*, similar to *i solum* in 363; their equivalence in meaning is shown by the phrases *tenuē hoc facies i* 369 and *i si facis solum* 365. *Tenuē i* would easily become corrupted to *tenuē si* from the *si* of the next line, whence came *tenuēs i* of the codices. It is to be emphasized that *tenuēs i*, in which *tenuēs* is the present subjunctive of *tenuāre*,² has the

¹ Kent, T. A. P. A. XLI 1-5.

² *Tenuēs* cannot be the plural feminine adjective, for names of letters are neuter in Lucilius, as we see in 363, 365, and in

351 A primum est, hinc incipiam.

379 S nostrum et semigraecei quod dicimus sigma

metrical value $\cup \cup - -$, though it stands for $\cup \cup -$; and that the verb *tenuet* alone (the only alternative to *tenuet i*) would be remarkable, since all other comments mention the letter *e* or *i*—except that in 360, which likewise is suspicious from the lack of the name of the letter. Marx¹ relies upon the use of *attenuatio* in Auct. ad Herenn. IV 21, 29, to justify the use of the verb *tenuare*. The passage is: *adnominatio . . . multis et variis rationibus conficitur. attenuatio aut complexione eiusdem litterae sic . . .* The examples that follow show that *attenuatio* is the 'exclusion', *complexio* the 'inclusion' of the letter in question. The object of the verb *tenuare* would then of necessity be the name of the letter, not the word containing the letter. Now *tenuare* in this sense would be a strictly technical word, and without its object expressed would be distinctly difficult to understand. But Lucilius himself tells us:²

595 nec doctissimis <nec scribo indoctis nimis>. Man<i/>ium
596 Persium<ue> haec legere nolo, Iunium Congum uolo,

in which the additions are by Marx, following the evidence of Crassus ap. Cic. de Or. II 6, 25: *nam ut C. Lucilius, homo et doctus et perurbanus, dicere solebat neque se ab indoctissimis neque a doctissimis legi uelle, quod alteri nihil intellegerent, alteri plus fortasse quam ipse, de quo etiam scripsit "Persium non curo legere"*. It is quite in accord with this that we find that all these precepts on *i* and *ei* are couched in the simplest language, containing not a single technical term, and at times even of a half jocular nature, as in *cum dare furei iusseris*.³ In fact, they seem to be mere mnemonic devices, as Lindsay⁴ suggests, and may be paralleled by the English jingles on the defective declension of *nemo*:

Of *nemo* never let me see
Neminis and *nemine*,

and on the spelling of *ei* and *ie*:

I before *e*,
Except after *c*,
And when sounded as *a*,
As in *neighbor* and *weigh*.

¹ II 134.

³ V. p. 282.

² Apud Plin. N. H. praef. 7.

⁴ V. p. 272.

Therefore *tenues*, a severely technical term, would be out of harmony with the purpose of these rules. But *tenue i*, 'a slender *i*', as opposed to a 'fat' diphthong, is a term readily intelligible to all. The correct reading in 359 is accordingly *tenue i*.

The case of *militiam* is noteworthy. Marx¹ on *pilam* says: Accusativum non tolles cum antea legatur "meilitiam", postea "*pilum quo piso tenues*". But *militiam* is here in the accusative merely *metri gratia*; as for *pilam*, its position between *militiam* and *pilum* (which may be either nominative or accusative) causes its assimilation in ending to the other two. As we have seen, *tenues* here and in the following line is hardly a verb governing these examples as objects; against this are the considerations just mentioned, and the case of *miles*, which is coordinate with *militiam*.

The next set of examples, with the comment, is:

'pilam' in qua lusimus, 'pilum'
quo piso, tenues.

Marx² defends the *in* by citing

641 cum <in> stadio, in gymnasio, in duplici corpus siccassem *pila*

and adds: Itaque i brevis semper secundum Lucilium i sola scribenda est. There is however an essential difference: *duplex pila* is the name of a specific game, while *pila* alone is not. Besides this, we have already seen that the length of the name of the letters forbids his text here, certainly preventing us from considering *pilam* as a possibility. Moreover, Lucilius is not (pace Marx) dealing here with *i*, but with *ī*. If then the word be *pilam*, it is either the word *pila* 'pillar' or the word *pila* 'mortar'. Which it is, is clearly shown by Velius Longus GL. VII 56 K.: idemque *peila* quibus milites utuntur per e et i scribenda existimat, at *pila* in qua pinsetur per i (*sic cod.*).³ *Pilam* therefore is the word meaning 'mortar'. *In qua* is accordingly entirely in place; but the *lusimus* is manifestly wrong. The perfect tense strikes our attention at once: Dousa took such offense that he emended it to the present *ludimus*; all editors followed

¹ II 134.

² II 134.

³ This is the passage that misled Müller into emending *pilum quo* to *pilam qua*.

him until Marx, who conservatively returned to the reading of the codex. By the principle of the lectus difficilior *lusimus* can hardly come from *ludimus*. But if *pilam* mean 'mortar', *pinsi-**mus* is the word that must have stood here, and this reading is hinted at by the citation from Velius Longus. The corruption is easily followed. The three strokes of *in* became reduced to two, and these, being between consonants, were read as the vowel *u*; then the influence of *pilam*, understood as *pilam*, caused the scribe to change the unintelligible *pusimus* to *lusimus*. Like *pinsimus*, thus proved to have contained the *n*, *pinso* must be written in the next verse, and not *piso*.¹

As for the verb *tenues* 360, the failure to mention the letter under discussion is suspicious, as we have already seen. In order to overcome this difficulty, Dousa changed to *tenues i*, omitting *si* in the next sentence, where it was needed. Therefore, though the subjunctive *tenues* is perfectly intelligible, = *tenue facias*, still the omission of the name of the letter as object and the technical nature of the expression cause me to propose *tenue i*, as in 359. Since this was followed by *si plura*, it might easily, through dittography of the *s*, become *tenues* (or *tenuis* or *tenueis*, either easily changed to *tenues* by a scribe who understood them as being nom.-acc. plurals of *i*-stems). Our text then is:

‘pilam’ in qua pinsimus, ‘pilum’
quo pinso, tenue i.

Pila ‘mortar’ is from an earlier **pins-lā*, and *pilum* ‘pestle’ is from earlier **pins-lom*; both are derivatives to *pi(n)so* ‘I. pound’, and have original *i* lengthened by compensation upon the loss of the *s* before the *l*. Lucilius is therefore perfectly justified in requiring *a mere i*, *tenue i*, in both these words.

The next section is:

si plura haec feceris pila
quae iacimus, addes e ‘peila’ ut plenius fiat.

I would here make no change in the text, except that of *pila* to *peila*. The question of the meaning comes up: Does Lucilius mean that *peila* ‘spears’ has an *e* to distinguish it from the

¹ Therefore *piso* of Marx and *pisunt* of Müller and Keil in the next verse are faulty spellings.

singular of the same word, or does he mean that this distinguishes it from forms of *pīla* 'mortar' and *pīlum* 'pestle'? If the former, Lucilius is wrong in making such a distinction. Now the passage from Velius Longus, already cited, paraphrases this passage, but takes no account of the question of the number of *peila*; and the Lucilian passage itself states that the purpose of the *e* is "that *peila* may become 'fuller'". Had a discrimination between singular and plural of the word been the point at issue, he would surely have stated the spelling of the singular, and have ended the verse 361 with a (metrical) equivalent of *ut peila plura fiant*; cf. 365 *ut puerei plures fiant*.

Peila 'spears' has therefore, according to Lucilius, the diphthong. The accepted etymology¹ is **pigslom*, to the root *pig-* or *pik-* seen in *pignus* 'fist', etc. An alternative, admitted by Walde as a possibility, is Niedermann's connection² of the word with Lith. *peilis* 'knife', to the root *pei-* without the determinative *k* or *g*. *Pilum* would then be from **pei-lom*, and would have a right to the *e* given it by Lucilius, since it contained the diphthong originally.

The next passage, 362-363, reads:

porro hoc si filius Luci
fecerit, *i solum*, ut 'Corneli Cornificique'.

Lucilius is here discussing the form of the genitive singular of nouns having *-ius* in the nominative, and prescribes the *i* as against the *ei*. Special attention must be called to the fact that he is NOT trying to distinguish *-i* and *-ei*, since *-ei* in such genitives appears for the first time in Catullus;³ yet all editors, following the Roman grammarians,⁴ consider that such is his intent. *i solum*, however, does not necessarily mean one *i* as opposed to two; in 365 *i solum* is used of *i* in *pupilli* and in

¹ Walde, Lat. et. Wörterb., s. v. In the second edition he suggests **peigslom*, "falls des Lucilius . . . *peila* auf echter Tradition fusst"; but this would give **pillum*!

² I. F. XV 113.

³ Cf. Merrill, Univ. of Calif. Public. in Class. Philol., II, pp. 57-79; though Merrill takes issue with Bentley's dictum on this point, still the genitive in *-ei* is not proved with certainty before Catullus.

⁴ Charis. I 78, 5 ad 79, 1; Cassiod. VII 206, 21-27; Beda VII 251, 6-20; also Marx II 409-410, ad versus 1294-5.

pueri, where there can be no question of *-ii*. Now we know from early inscriptions that the ending of the genitive singular of *o*-stems is *-ī*, not the diphthong,¹ and thus the contraction to a single *ī* in *io*-stems took place early. Lucilius is therefore right in pronouncing the genitive singular of nouns in *-ius* to end in *-ī*, and not in the diphthong.

Verses 364-366 need not be repeated here, since the text is good. Lucilius says that the genitive singular of *o*-stems ends in *-ī* and that the nominative plural ends in *-ei*. That his statement is perfectly correct is shown by the testimony of the older inscriptions.²

The next passage, 367-368, reads:

mendaci furique addes e, cum dare furi
iusseris.

I would read, at the beginning, *mendacei furi* (as did Dousa), for evident reasons. It seems a little forced to say "when you bid (someone) make a present to a thief", for of course no one is going to do such a thing. Therefore Lachmann gives in his text cum 'dato, Furi', iusseris,³ "when you direct 'You shall give, Furius'", a particularly pointless remark, leaving *mendaci furique* without any connection with the rest of the passage; more than that, the vocative of *Furius* would have *-ī*, not *-ei*, though a statement on this point does not appear in the extant fragments of Lucilius. Müller's cum 'dabis, Furi', iusseris has precisely the same defect, though he attaches the fragment directly to 363, and makes *mendaci* and *furi* further examples of genitives of *io*-stems, like *Corneli* and *Cornifici*. The manner in which the citation is given by Quintilian manifestly forbids this. Curiously, the obvious fact that Lucilius was using *dare* merely as a non-technical means of indicating that the forms are in the dative case escaped them, but has since been seen and commented upon by Marx.⁴

Lucilius therefore prescribes *-ei* in the dative singular of consonant stems. That this is correct, is well known.⁵

¹ Sommer, op. cit., p. 369.

² Sommer, op. cit., p. 368, pp. 377-378.

³ Cf. R. Bouterwek, *Quaestiones Lucilianae*, p. 14, Elberfeld, 1857.

⁴ II 137; so also earlier editors. Cf. also Skutsch, *Glotta* I 310 fn.

⁵ Sommer, op. cit., p. 408.

The last passage, 369-370, reads :

'hoc illi factum est uni', tenue hoc facies i :

'haec ille fecere', addes e, ut pinguius fiat.

The only change I would suggest is the adoption of Schmidt's *adde* to avoid the total elision of *e*, a matter that has already been discussed. *e* is here before a caesura and bears the metrical stress; it therefore keeps its length, though before a vowel. This change involves, of course, no change in meaning. Lucilius states that the dative singular in such words as *illi* and *uni* ends in *-ī*, and the nominative plural masculine of the same words ends in *-ei*. The latter statement is correct; the former is of course incorrect.¹ This is the first definite error in which Lucilius is detected, for *meille*, *meillia*, *peilum* 'spear' are at least possibly right, and all his other examples are surely right. How did he come to err in *illi* and *uni*, dative singular? The reason is, I think, not hard to find, and has already been stated in brief by Marx.² The pronouns and pronominal adjectives with genitive in *-ius* and dative in *-ī* are for the rest declined precisely like *o-* *ā*-stems, with the exception of the masculine nominative singular and the nominative and accusative neuter singular of a few of them. Lucilius therefore associated them with the adjectives of this declension. Finding that the genitive of masculine and neuter nouns with *-us -um -ius -ium* in the nominative, and the vocative singular of masculine nouns with *-ius* in the nominative ended in *-ī*, and that on the other hand the nominative and vocative plural of such masculine nouns had *-ei* (or *-iei*) and the dative and ablative plural of the same, whether masculine or neuter, ended in *-eis* (or *-ieis*), he drew the conclusion that in this declension, where there was an *ī*-sound, the spelling *ī* belonged to the singular and the spelling *ei* belonged to the plural. Thereby he was led into his error in the matter of *illi* and *uni* and other similar datives. Special attention should be paid to the fact that this error did not cause him to go astray in the spelling of the dative singular of consonant stems: possibly the *-īs* (not *-eis*) accusative ending in the plural of *ī*-stems, whence it was often extended to consonant stems, prevented such an error.

¹ Sommer, op. cit., p. 473.

² II 137.

The results of the investigation are:

I. The following, according to Lucilius, should be written with *ei*:

meille, meillia: this cannot be shown to be wrong.

peilum 'spear': this cannot be shown to be wrong.

ending of nom. voc. pl. of *o*-stems, masc. (and fem.): correct.

Example: *puerei*.

ending of dat. sing. of consonant stems: correct. Examples: *mendacei, furei*.

ending of nom. voc. plur. of certain pronouns and pronominal adjectives: correct. Example: *illei*.

II. The following, according to Lucilius, should be written with *i*:

miles, militia: correct.

pila 'mortar', *pilum* 'pestle': correct.

ending of gen. sing. of *io*-stems: correct. Examples: *Luci, Corneli, Cornifici, Lucili*.

ending of gen. sing. of *o*-stems: correct. Examples: *pupilli, pueri*.

ending of dat. sing. of certain pronouns and pronominal adjectives: wrong, but reason for error plain. Examples: *illi, uni*.

Our conclusion is that Lucilius is within narrow limits accurate in his rules for the writing of *i* and *ei*, but that he did not understand the linguistic basis for the difference, and therefore fell into one error in the ten rules which he gives us.

Three points may now be treated briefly. In Marius Victorinus GL. VI 18 we find the statement that earlier grammarians prescribed *ei* in *sica* and in the military *vinea*, but *i* in *fistula* and in the *vinea* of viticulture. As there is nothing to connect this statement with Lucilius, I have refrained from comment upon it.

The fragment given by Marx as

1294 — — — seruandi numeri et uersus faciendi

1295 nos Caeli Numeri numerum ut seruemus modumque,

from Charisius GL. I 78, after Dousa, who fills in the first verse with *quare*, appears in Keil, Müller and Lachmann as

seruandi Numeri numerum ut seruemus modumque.

Marx¹ shows however, in his comment on the verses, that they

¹ II 409-410.

are not grammatical rules, but of an entirely different nature, though wrongly understood by Charisius. They therefore do not come within the scope of the present article.

The relative order of the five fragments contained in 358-370 is one upon which there is little evidence. In Quint. I 7 15 the *pueri* passage (364-366) is stated to precede the *mendaci* passage (367-368). In Charis. I 78-79 the *filius Luci* passage (362-363) is stated to precede the *pueri* passage (364-366). In Vel. Long. VII 56 the *pueri* passage (364-366), the *illi* passage (369-370) and a paraphrase of part of the *mille* passage (358-361) are cited in that order, though without a direct or even an indirect implication that this is their relative order in the original. We may infer that the pronouns were treated after the nouns, and place the *illi* passage after the *mendaci* passage. Then the position of 358-361 remains uncertain; but on the slight indication given by Vel. Long. and by the allusion in *item*,¹ I am inclined to place it at the end, instead of at the beginning. The result is precisely the order of Lachmann. Yet as the edition of Marx certainly will be the definitive edition of Lucilius for many years to come, I have not felt justified in changing the order in the text of the fragments which is given later. The following table shows the relative orders given the fragments by the different editors; each passage is cited by the first example in the classical spelling of the word:

Dousa	}	pueri	illi	mille	mendaci	Luci
Ed. Bipontina						
Perreau						
Schmidt	}	Luci	pueri	illi	mendaci	mille
Gerlach		pueri	illi	mendaci	mille	
Elsperger						
Lachmann		Luci	pueri	mendaci	illi	mille
Müller	}	pueri	illi	Luci	mendaci	mille
Merrill						
Marx		mille	Luci	pueri	mendaci	illi

In view of the numerous changes that have in the course of this paper been made in the text and in its interpretation, there now follows the text with translation and critical apparatus, and then the sources for the passages, with other testimonia veterum, are cited in full.

¹ V. p. 276.

I. TEXT, TRANSLATION AND APPARATUS CRITICUS.

The following editions of these fragments of Lucilius have been carefully compared, and their readings appear in the apparatus, as well as the readings of the manuscripts. Of these editions, Elspeger follows precisely the text of Gerlach; Perreau agrees with the Bipontine edition except in having *Lucilli* 366 and *quum* 367; Merrill follows Mueller except in having *puerei* 365, *illei* 370. Except for 362-363, Dousa (p. 113) admits his debt to Scaliger, and his readings are usually cited under Scaliger's name; but I have here consistently cited them under Dousa's own name. Further, no account has been taken of the apostrophe as a typographical substitute for a final *s* not helping to make position.

Dousa. F. Dousa, C. Lucili Satyrarum Reliquiae, 1597, Plantin, Lugd. Bat.

Bipontina. A. Persii Flacci et Dec. Jun. Juvenalis Satirae ad optimas editiones collatae; accedit Sulpiciae satira; C. Lucilii satirographorum principis fragmenta (Societas Bipontina), 1785; Biponti ex typographia Societatis.

Perreau. A. Perreau, Juvenalis et Persius; item Lucilii fragmenta; vol. III, 1830, Lemaire, Paris.

Schmidt. L. F. Schmidt, C. Lucilii Satirarum quae de libro nono supersunt disposita et illustrata, in Programm des Friedrichs-Werderschen Gymnasiums, 1840, Nauck, Berlin.

Gerlach. F. D. Gerlach, C. Lucilii Saturarum Reliquiae, 1846, Meyer et Zeller, Turici.

Elsperger. C. Elspeger, Commentatio de satira Lucilii, in Sollennia Anniversaria in Gymnasio Regio Onoldino, 1851, Bruegel.

Mueller. L. Mueller, C. Lucili Saturarum Reliquiae, 1872, Teubner, Leipzig.

Lachmann. C. Lachmann, C. Lucilii Saturarum, 1876, Reimer, Berlin (Lachmann died 1851, but this was not printed until this date).

Merrill. E. T. Merrill, Fragments of Roman Satire, 1897, American Book Company, New York.

Marx. F. Marx, C. Lucilii Carminum Reliquiae, 2 vols., 1904-5, Teubner, Leipzig.

Keil. H. Keil, Grammatici Latini, Teubner, Leipzig: vol. I, 1857; vol. VI, 1874; vol. VII, 1880.

- 358 'meille' hominum, duo 'meillia' item: huc e utroque opus.
 'miles',
 359 'militiam': tenue i. 'pilam' in qua pinsimus, 'pilum'
 360 quo pinso: tenue i. si plura haec feceris 'peila'
 361 quae iacimus, addes e, 'peila' ut plenius fiat.

Meille, a 'thousand', of men, two *meillia*, 'thousands', likewise: these words both need *e*. *Miles*, 'soldier', and *militia*, 'military service'—plain *i*. *Pila*, 'mortar', in which we pound, *pilum*, 'pestle', with which I pound—plain *i*. But if you mention several of these *peila*, 'spears', that we throw, add *e*, that *peila* may become "fuller".

358-361: apud Terentium Scaurum GL. VII 19, 1-4; cf. Marium Victorinum GL. VI 17, 21 ad 18, 10, Velium Longum GL. VII 56, 13-14.

Codices Terentii: *B* Bernensis 330.

P Palatinus 174.

Editio Terentii: ω Basileensis, anno 1527.

358 mille *BP* ω : *meile* Dousa, *Bip.*, *Schm.*, *Gerl.*, *Muell.*; *meille* *Lachm.*, *Marx*; mille *Keil*.

duo milia *P* ω , $\cdot\overline{II}\cdot$ *B*; duo *meilia* *edd. plurimi*; duo *meillia* Dousa, *Bip.*, *Lachm.*

item: *omnes edd. priores ante item dividerunt*; *Kent post.*

huc *BP* ω ; huic Dousa et *edd. plur.*; heice *Muell.* (cf. *Afran. Except. fr. III ap. Frag. Rom. Com. ed.*³ *Ribb.*); hisce *Keil*; huc e *Marx*.

mille *BP* ω ; *meiles* Dousa et *edd. plur.*; miles *Kent*.

359 *militiam* *B* ω , *miliciam* *P*; *meilitiam* Dousa et *edd. plur.*; *militiam* *Kent*. *Post militiam punctum posuerunt omnes edd. priores*; *Kent ante pilam posuit*.

tenues i *BP*, tenue si ω ; *tenues* i Dousa et *edd. plur.*; *tenuest* i *Muell.*; tenue i *Kent*.

pilam in qua lusimus *BP* ω ; *pilam* qua ludimus Dousa et *edd. plur.*; *pilai* qua ludimus *Muell.*; *pilam* in qua lusimus *Marx*; *pilam* in qua pinsimus *Kent*.

359-360 *pilum* quo ipso *P* ω , *pilum* quo ipso *B*.

pilum quo Dousa et *edd. plur.*; *pilam* qua *Muell. ex Velio*.

pinso Dousa et *edd. plur.*; *pisunt* *Muell.* (*quod t sequitur*), *Keil*; *piso* *Marx*.

360 *tenues* si plura haec feceris *pila* *BP* ω .

- 362 porro hoc si filius 'Luci'
 363 fecerit, i solum, ut 'Corneli' 'Cornifici' que.
 364 iam " 'puerei' uenere " : e postremum facito atque i,
 365 ut puerei plures fiant. i si facis solum,
 366 'pupilli', 'pueri', 'Lucili', hoc unius fiet.

Then if the son *Luci*, 'of Lucius', should do so-and-so, *i* alone, as in *Corneli*, 'of Cornelius', and in *Cornifici*, 'of Cornificius'.

Now "*puerei*, 'the boys', came": set an *e* and an *i* at the end, that *puerei*, 'the boys', may become several in number. But if you set *i* alone, *pupilli*, 'of an orphan', *pueri*, 'of a boy', *Lucili*, 'of Lucilius', this will mean 'belonging to one'.

tenues i. plura *Dousa et edd. plur.*; tenue. si *Muell., Keil, Marx*; tenue i. si *Kent*.

peila *Dousa et edd. plur.*; pila *Muell., Keil, Marx*.

361 adēē pella ut plenus fiat *B*.

adde se pella ut plenius fiat *P*.

addere pella ut plenius fiat *ω*.

adde e peila ut plenius fiat *Dousa et omnes edd.*

362-363: Apud Charisium GL. I 78, 13-14; cf. Cassiodorum GL. VII 206, 21-27, Bedam GL. VII 251, 6-10 and 16-20.

362 porro hoc uui (*incertum*) fecerit colum ut Corneli Cornificique *codex Neap.*

porro hoc si filius Luci ferit collum ut Corneli Cornificique *Dousa (e cod. Coloniensi iam deperdito), Bip.*

porro hoc si filius Luci: feceris i solum *Schmidt*.

porro hoc sit 'filius Luci': feceris i solum *Muell.*

porro hoc, 'filius Luci', feceris i solum *Lachm., Keil*.

porro hoc si filius Luci fecerit, i solum *Marx*.

363 ut Corneli Cornificique *Dousa et omnes edd.*

Hoc fragmentum Gerlach omisit quod emendari vix posset.

364-366: Apud Velium Longum GL. VII 56, 7-9; dimidia prior apud Quintilianum I 7, 15; dimidia posterior apud Charisium GL. I 79, 1; cf. Aulum Gellium XIII 25, 4, Marium Victorinum VI 17, 21 ad 18, 10.

R editio princeps Velii, Romae, 1587.

364 puerbi *cod. Velii*; puerei, puere, pueri *codd. Quint.*; puerei *edd. omnes*.

367 'mendacei' 'furei' que addes e, cum dare 'furei'
 368 iusseris.

369 "hoc 'illi' factum est 'uni'": tenue hoc facies i.
 370 "haec 'illei' fecere": adde e, ut pinguius fiat.

To *mendacei*, 'to a liar', and to *furei*, 'to a thief', add an *e*, when you bid something be given *furei*, 'to a thief'.

"So-and-so was done *illi uni*, 'with that one fellow'": make this *i* plain. "*Illei*, 'those fellows', have done so-and-so": add *e*, that the word may become "fatter".

et *cod. Velii*; e, ut, et *codd. Quint.*; e *edd. omnes*.

365 ut plures faciant *cod. Velii et R*; ut pueri plures fiant *codd. Quint.*; ut plures puerei fiant *Dousa, Bip.*; ut pueri plures fiant *Muell.*; ut puerei plures fiant *edd. ceteri, incluso Merrillio*.

366 . . . pueri Lucii hoc unius fieri *cod. Charis*.

pupilli pueri et Lucilli hoc unius fiet *cod. Velii*.

pupilli pueri huc unius fiet *R*.

pupilli pueri Luceili hoc unius fiet *Dousa, Bip., Gerl., Schmidt*.

pupilli pueri Lucilli hoc unius fiet *Perreau*.

pupilli pueri Lucili hoc unius fiet *Lachm., Muell., Keil, Marx*.

367-368: Apud Quintilianum I 7, 15; cf. Aulum Gellium XIII 25, 4.

mendaci furique *codd. et edd. plur.*; mendacei fureique *Dousa, Bip., Gerl.* Post furique punctum posuit *Lachm.*; idem *Muell.*, qui haec nomina ut genetivos singularis numeri versu 363 iunctos intellegit; *ceteri punctum non posuerunt*.

quum *Dousa, Perreau, Schmidt*; cum *ceteri edd.*

dari furei *cod. Lassbergianus vel Friburgensis*. dare furi *cod. Turicensis*, dare fueri *cod. Ambrosianus*; dabis Furi *Muell.*; dato Furei *Lach.*; dare furei *Dousa et ceteri edd. (Lucil. et Quint.)*.

369-370: Apud Velium Longum GL. VII 56, 11-12.

R editio princeps *Velii*, Romae, 1587.

369 factum est *cod. et edd. plur.*; factumst *Muell.*

hoc (*post tenue*) *cod. et edd. plur.*; heic *vel huic Muell.*; heic *Merrill*.

370 haec ille facere addes e ut pinguius facit *cod.*; faciat *R.*
 ille facere facit "*utrumque dudum emendatum*"—*Marx.*
 illei *Dousa et edd. plur., incluso Merrillio*; illi *Muell.*
 addes e *Dousa, Bip., Marx*; adde e *edd. ceteri.*

IV. TESTIMONIA VETERUM.

A. Quintilianus I 7, 15; text of Bonnell, 1854.

diutius duravit, ut E I iungendis eadem ratione qua Graeci
 « uterentur; ea casibus numerisque discreta est, ut Lucilius
 praecepit

iam pueri . . . plures fiant (364–365).

ac deinceps idem:

mendaci . . . iusseris (367–368).

B. Aulus Gellius XIII 25, 4; text of Hosius, 1903.

id quoque in eodem (XXIV) libro Nigidiano animadvertimus:
 si 'huius' inquit 'amici' vel 'huius magni' scribas, unum i facito
 extremum; sin vero 'hii magnii', 'hii amicii'¹ casu multitudinis
 recto, tum <i> ante i scribendum erit², atque id ipsum facies in
 similibus. item, si 'huius terrai' scribas, i littera sit³ extrema,
 si 'huic terrae', per e scribendum est. item, 'mi'⁴ qui scribit in
 casu interrogandi, velut cum dicimus 'mi'⁴ studiosus', per unum
 i scribat, non per e; at cum 'mei'⁵, tum per e et i scribendum
 est, quia dandi casus est.

Potius legendum cum edd. vetustioribus:

1 'hei magnei', 'hei amicei' 2 tum ante i scribendum
 erit e 3 fit 4 'mei' 5 'mehei'

Adnot. crit. ex editione Hosii.:

mi: mi *edd. vet.*, mei ω .

mei: mei γ , miei δ .

ω consensus codicum (A)PRV aut omnium aut reliquorum.

δ archetypus codicum (B)QZ.

γ archetypus codicum NOTX.

C. Charisius GL. I 78, 5 ad 79, 1.

*Lucius et Aemilius et cetera*¹ nomina quae ante u habent i
 duplici i genetivo *singulari* finiri² debent, *ne*³ necesse sit adversus
*observationem nominum*⁴ nominativo minorem fieri genetivum;
 idque Varro tradens adicit⁵ *vocativum quoque* singularem⁶ talium
 nominum per duplex i⁷ scribi debere, *sed propter differentiam*
casuum corrumpi.⁸ *Lucilius tamen et per unum i* genetivum⁹

scribi posse existimat: ait enim "servandi Numeri numerum ut¹⁰ servemus *modumque*". numquam enim hoc intulisset, nisi et Numerium per i, huius *Numeri*¹¹ faciendum crederet. denique et in libro VIII¹² sic ait

porro . . . Cornificique¹³ (362-363).

et paulo post

pueri . . . fieri (365-366).

Ita restituit locum Keilius, codicis Neapolitani scriptura ex parte deleta; ex codice Coloniensi iam deperdito, cui tamen Marx II 135 fidem tribuit, F. Dousa apud Lucilii reliq. lib. IX fr. 7 habet has lectiones aut supplementa:

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 Lucius Aemilius et caetera | 9 per unum i in genitivo |
| 2 ii genetivos singulares finire | 10 numeri et versus faciendi nos |
| 3 ut; non <i>ante</i> minorem <i>inse-</i> | Caeli Numeri numerum ut |
| <i>ruit Dousa.</i> | 11 nisi et Caelii et Numerii per |
| 4 nominum <i>omisit Dousa</i> | ii huius Numerii |
| 5 adiecit | 12 in libro quarto |
| 6 vocativum singularem quoque | 13 porro hoc si filiu' Luci ferit |
| 7 ii | collum ut Corneli Cornifici- |
| 8 corripit | que |

Apud codicem duplici ii (versu 2), corrumpi i (v. 6), ad pro ait (v. 10).

D. Marius Victorinus GL. VI 17, 21 ad 18, 10.

cum vero eadem i e litterae iuncta esset, non solum pro longa syllaba accipiebatur, sed nominativum pluralem ita scripta significabat, ut amicei bonei doctei Romanei et similia. at si per solum i scripta esset, eadem genetivum singularem faciebat ut huius amici et cetera. denique omnes qui de orthographia scripserunt de nulla scriptura tam diu quam diu de hac quaerunt, quae per i litteram singularem genetivum et [quae] per ei litteras nominativum pluralem faciat, locuti partim acute, *partim*, ut mihi quidem videtur, inepte, illud etiam ridicule (nam mihi quaedam succurrunt): pilum aiunt militare et vineam, si sit subter quam milites aggerem instituunt, et sicam [et silicem] quae secet per e et i scribenda; at si pilum sit quo pinsitores utuntur, et vinea quae ruri colitur et fistula per i. a quibus libenter quaererem, quo modo scripturi essent aedificii pila, et quo modo singularem discerne-

rent a plurali in his, res dies species, et his similibus. Sam-nitem, licet per omnes casus i longam custodiat, tamen nomina-tivo correpta i *scribite*, ut sanguis pulvis.

E. Terentius Scaurus GL. VII 18, 23 ad 19, 12.

itemque quod Lucilius, ubi i exile est, per se iubet scribi, at ubi plenum est, praeponendum esse e credit his versibus,

mille . . . fiat (358-361).

quam inconstantiam Varro arguens in eundem errorem diversa via delabatur, dicens in plurali quidem numero debere litterae i e praeponi, in singulari vero minime, cum alioqui i non aliud in singulari quam *in plurali, neque aliud in media* quam in extrema syllaba sonet, ut in verbis manifestum est. dicimus enim 'mitto misi misimus', nisi aliam hic vult esse rationem [quod absurdum est], ut, cum verba quoque ex syllabis constent, ex diversa regula corrigantur.

F. Velius Longus GL. VII 55, 27 ad 57, 5.

hic quaeritur etiam an per e et i quaedam debeant scribi secundum consuetudinem graecam. non nulli enim ea quae producerentur sic scripserunt, alii contenti fuerunt huic productioni i longam aut notam dedisse. alii vero, quorum est item Lucilius, varie scriptitaverunt, siquidem in iis quae producerentur alia per i longam, alia per e et i notaverunt, velut differentia quaedam separantes, ut cum diceremus 'viri', si essent plures, per e et i scriberemus, si vero esset unius (*ita Muell. et Lachm.*; unus *P*) viri, per i notaremus; et Lucilius in nono

iam puerei . . . hoc unius fiet (364-366).

item

hoc illi . . . fiat (369-370).

idemque peila, quibus milites utuntur, per e et i scribenda existimat, at pilam qua pinsitur (pila in qua pinsetur *P*) per i. hoc mihi videtur supervacaneae esse observationis. nam si omnino in scribendo discernenda casuum numerorumque ambiguitas est, quid faciemus in his nominibus quorum scriptio discrimen non admittit, ut aedes sedes nubes, cum et una et plures eodem modo dicantur et scribantur? quid cum dicimus gestus fluctus portus, cum et genetivus singularis et nominativus et accusativus et vocativus pluralis eodem modo scribantur? quid denique in iis quae ambiguitatem habent inter nomina et verba, *ut* rotas feras? nam tam hae rotae rotas faciunt, quam roto rotas [rotat], et fera feras

et fero feras. sic nec aliter scribitur amor, et ex nomine facit amoris, ex verbo amaris. satis ergo collectum quaedam per e et i non debere scribi, sed tantum per i, cum apud Graecos quoque ex veteri illa consuetudine inveniantur nomina quae per i scribuntur, quamvis producte enuntientur.

G. Cassiodorus GL. VII 206, 21-27, ex L. Caecilio (*sic cd. pro* Caesellio) Vindice.

Luci magni magi cum in genetivis singularibus dicimus, interest quos nominativos habeant: proinde enim intererit, utrum per duo i an per unum debeant scribi. si lucus magnus magus sunt nominativi eorum, unum i in genetivo habebunt: plurali quoque nominativo et vocativo, sed et dativo et ablativo similiter scribentur. si autem Lucius Magnus magius proferantur, duo i in genetivo habebunt, Lucii Magnii magii, quod ipsum Lucilius adnotavit, cum a numero Numerius discerneret.

H. Beda de arte metrica GL. VII 251, 6-10
dicit enim Paulinus

oblectans inopem sensu fructuque peculii
quod si quis dixerit hic eum more antiquorum dactylum in fine
posuisse versiculi, legat quod idem alibi dicit,
excoluit biugis laquearii et marmore fabri:

251, 16-20

Fortunatus:

Vincentii Hispaniae surgit ab arce decus.
cuius scansio versus par est praefati, nisi forte regulam Lucilii
secuti sunt, qui Lucium (*ita P¹F*, lucilium *P²L et Keil*) et
Aemilium et cetera nomina, quae ante u habent i non solum in
vocativo, sed etiam in genetivo casu per unum i existimat scribi
posse.

F codex Friburgensis 199, nunc Monacensis 6399.

L codex Leidensis bibliothecae publicae 122.

P codex Parisinus Sangercanensis 1189.

ROLAND G. KENT.

UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA.